



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LESSONS OF THE NEW YORK CITY ELECTION.

I.

THE REPUBLICAN VIEW.

FIRST freedom, then wisdom. The scales have fallen from the eyes of fifty thousand voters in New York City ; if they learn to use their sense of sight, they will vote more wisely after a time than they did November 2d. They have escaped from bondage to halls and rings ; as they gain wisdom, they will not submit instead to a bondage of unions. It is a good thing that they have learned that the city government is what they and other workers have made it. Their votes for political jobbers, their blind devotion to a party name, have made bad government easy in New York ; they will learn in time that blind obedience even to their own unions means government not for the greatest good of the greatest number.

It looked to many like a volcanic outburst, destructive and fatal. Socialism gave a lurid tinge to its oratory ; Anarchists floated on the crest of the wave. Appeals to the House of Want against the House of Have, it was feared, would kindle in this country the flames that destroyed Paris. But the generalship of irreproachable phrases and unlimited pipe-clay is not the sort that carries the forlorn hope over the deadly breach. One must not infer that a revolutionary leader would be fiery in speech and unguarded in plan, if burdened with the responsibilities of power. The logical tendency of this outburst was against Anarchy. The shrill scream only gave warning that the safety valve was opened in good time. Men who had not learned that in this country the ballot rules, and that the majority at the polls is also the majority when it comes to blows, have ceased to think of guns and bombs since they have seen that by the ballot, and only by the ballot, can real or fancied evils in this country be remedied. Anarchy lost its battle when Labor began to organize.

Of those who had most faith that the sober sense of American workers would suppress every lawless impulse, many dreaded the power of the Trades Unions. More than once unwise and unjust, in previous struggles, the Unions had come to be feared as enemies of employers, rather than as enemies of abuses. Their tendency, it was thought, was to array labor against capital in a warfare hurtful to both. If Unions are to dictate how men shall vote, it was asked, wherein are these men more free than the mere slaves of party? But the only freedom that is of any use is inside the man. When he ceases to worship a democratic party as the African does his fetich, and begins to use his own eyes, a worker can soon judge for himself whether a Trades Union leads him for his own good or for his harm.

At all events, the leadership of the Unions, if sometimes mistaken, is infinitely better than slavery to the pot-house politicians who rule only to rob. Given 100,000 workers, blindly Democratic, and 10,000 officials and hirelings to pack Democratic caucuses, with 10,000 or 20,000 saloon voters to put votes where the money is spent, and the inevitable net result is a conspiracy to plunder the people by means of their own votes. The 100,000 workers do not want to be plundered. But their votes made the Tweed Ring possible; their votes made Thompson and Squire, the bribed Aldermen, and the officials who can convict a poor man in a day, but cannot get at the cases of rich bribe-givers in six months. If law is unequal, and justice is a costly luxury, the workers' own blind partisanship has made the government what it is. If the carpenter's little home is taxed for all it is worth, while Vanderbilt's millions kindly consent to reside here on condition that forty-eight out of fifty of them shall be exempt from taxation, it is the partisanship of the workers that has made laws and officials. If the city is monopoly-ridden, the votes of labor put on the saddle and tighten the girths. If, in short, government here is not of the people, by the people, or for the people, it is because the workers have voted to have a government of the pot-houses; a government which money can buy, but which claims to own its voters as the ranchmen own their stock.

The marvel is that the volcanic eruption did not come long ago. For many years there has been scarcely the shadow of a pretense that government by the Democratic party in New York City was for the interests, or controlled by a regard for the welfare,

of the working people. The industrious worker of New York does not regard the hired runner of any party as his wisest adviser, or the saloon-keeper as his dearest friend; but he has voted the ticket made up for him by these worthies, and has called that self-government. The consequences having become burdensome, he resolves to vote for once as he pleases, and forthwith the town is in a panic, and property is besought with tears to come out and save itself from confiscation by voting for Mr. Hewitt. But it was not property that was in danger; it was only the power to get property without work. Had the workingmen elected a Mayor, they might have made many sad mistakes, from which they would have learned something, as boys learn to use edged tools. But they would have cleaned out the set of men who put Mr. Hewitt in nomination.

There was no necessity for such a choice. A larger number of the honest and industrious workers than voted for Mr. George had previously voted for Republican principles, holding them essential to the welfare of labor and the good of the country. To that belief most of them had adhered for years, though in a hopeless minority here, but in 1884 their number was swelled to at least 70,000 of the 90,000 votes for Mr. Blaine. Had these voters pleased, they could have drawn to their aid still larger reinforcements, and elected a Mayor. But it pleased some of them to support Mr. George; to transfer their strength to the smaller of the two bodies of workers which were seeking the defeat of Democratic rings. Then it pleased another fraction of the ninety thousand to think property in danger unless they supported Mr. Hewitt. So the honest workers who are Republican from conviction, and the other honest workers who have grown tired of being counted by Democratic drovers as their voting cattle, were both beaten by the rings. At least 153,000 of the votes cast in New York were the votes of industrious citizens who earn honest wages. The government ought to be for the welfare of those voters, and it is not. Perhaps 40,000 of them adhered to the Democratic party, no doubt with sincere conviction, but not one of them can make reply when asked what many years of Democratic government in this city have ever done to help workers. The conviction that Democracy has done nothing, the perception that such government was used to plunder the people, took more than 50,000 workers out of that party in a single month. Besides

47,000 Democrats who actually voted for other Democratic candidates at the same election, but did not vote for Mr. Hewitt, there were as many more as there were Republicans who did vote for him. Thus the phenomenon which has startled men is a revolt of a majority of Democratic workingmen against misgovernment by the Democratic party.

There are politicians who call it a crackling of thorns under a pot ; a blazing of dead leaves and dry stubble, which cannot last. Others reckon that it will spread like a prairie fire ; that it will sweep the rest of the honest workers out of the Democratic party, leaving only the official vote, the "heelers," and the saloon vote, and the vote of professional, trading, and property-owning Democrats. It will have an especially favorable opportunity in the election of delegates to the constitutional convention. But New York City does not make laws for the State or the nation. A labor party here, if it is to last, must have its roots in national issues, and its interlocking branches in other States. True, Labor elected a Congressman in Virginia and one in Wisconsin. It was barely defeated in one Chicago district, and in Mr. Carlisle's Kentucky district, if, indeed, the Knights are not right in claiming that their candidates in these two districts were counted out. It elected an Assemblyman in Paterson, and cast 6,300 votes for a Congressman in Newark. But these uprisings, like the white cloud that mounts from a working locomotive and the white cloud that hangs over an exploded magazine, though similar in appearance, differ in origin and meaning. The workingmen in this country cast a majority of the votes for each political party. If they were agreed, they could obtain what they want through either party ; but they are not agreed. Putting aside other matters, the workingmen are not of one mind on the questions which most largely and permanently affect the welfare of labor. Strong convictions on certain of these questions have drawn a majority of the workingmen in Northern States into the Republican party, and until those questions are settled no labor movement which does not accord with those convictions can enlist the support of more than a minority of the workers themselves. Until colored labor at the South has adequate defense in its rights, until home industry is safe from foreign competition, Mr. George can hardly be the Joshua, or even the Moses, of a new party.

When a Richmond mob howled for blood, because Knights of

Labor had taken a colored member with them to the theatre, Mr. Powderly and other thinking men asked at once: "Would this lawless spirit give decent protection to colored workers in any contest for their rights? If not, could Northern labor afford to compete with labor virtually enslaved?" Remedy there is none, except a free ballot and an honest count for every colored as for every white laborer. But that is exactly what the great body of workingmen who make up the Republican party have urged for fifteen years in vain. Consciences made callous by excusing crimes against free suffrage at the South are now defending the forgery of returns in Ohio and Indiana, the defeat of the labor candidate by the pupils of the convict, Mackin, in Chicago, and the contemptuous treatment of workingmen who claimed their right to inspect the counting of votes in Mr. Carlisle's district, and were driven away with threats of personal violence. He will find it easier now to obtain his seat by the decision of a party majority in the House, than to convince workingmen that he was elected. What faith can a New York workingman have in any labor movement which consents to these crimes against labor? He is forced to understand what Democratic methods are, and what the supremacy of these methods at the South means for him. It means that the votes of a million workers at the South are counted only when they are of no use; that the sheriffs, judges, and other local officials are beholden to employers, but not to workers; that a strike there is a conspiracy, but a lockout is not; and that New York labor must either give to Southern labor the protection of a free ballot and a fair count, or be prepared to compete with a servitude more complete than is known in England, Germany, or France. A labor party that tries to toss this issue into the ash-barrel will go there itself.

Probably Mr. George would say, with some warmth, that he had nothing to do with the Southern question. But he has had something to do with the tariff question, and thereby has made his support impossible for a large body of workers. The labor leaders elsewhere come in with scalps at their belts, because they have defended American industry against foreign competition, and upheld the tariff under which the development of that industry has been shaped for a quarter of a century. In New York, Mr. George stands for abolition of custom-houses and unlimited free trade. To supporters who have come from the Democratic party,

with its "tariff-for-revenue-only" platforms and its Morrison bills, Mr. George may well seem the ideal statesman, who frankly marches, with head erect and eyes front, toward the goal which Democratic politicians would reach by stealthy crawling on hands and knees in the dark. But to voters who appreciate Republican ideas, Mr. George does not seem a safe leader for American labor. He tells them that protection has not helped them; they know by experience that it has doubled the number of employers and of industrial establishments in the country, lifted wages, and aided labor powerfully. Who supposes that this antagonism of convictions and aims, between great bodies of laborers, will disappear or be ignored as trivial? Mr. Powderly does not. The workers who organized to defeat Mr. Morrison, of Illinois, and Mr. Carlisle, of Kentucky, and Mr. Hurd, of Ohio, and Mr. Lawler, of Chicago, and Mr. Griffin, of Virginia, certainly do not. As diversification of industry progresses at the South and West, supporters of protection multiply. Republican gains of four members in Virginia, two in North Carolina, and two in Kentucky, like the gains of five in Ohio, four in Illinois, three in Indiana, and two in Michigan, were largely due to the growing concentration of the votes of wage-earners in support of the policy and the party to which they give credit for a material advance in wages.

A labor party cannot be firm-jointed or long-lived that does not defend Southern labor and all labor; Southern labor, by equal suffrage and faithful administration of laws, and all labor by a protective tariff adapted to the needs of industries, which such a tariff has called into being. If a labor party admits these aims as its own, it will not waste its strength in fighting against the great army of wage-earners, who for twenty years have made the Republican party what it is. The uprising which startles men is not a revolution against the Republican party or its policy. It assails no Republican measures. It asks homes for the homeless, but the homestead bill was enacted by Republicans after many years of opposition by Democrats. It is led by men intelligent enough to know that the new administration found in operation the most efficient and economical government ever known in this country. That uprising has been most victorious where it has been in harmony with Republican principles of national policy. It has been weakest where it has aimed to help only a part of American labor, has handled matters with which Trades Unions

or Knights of Labor come directly into contact, and has ignored larger issues which affect the welfare of all labor. Meanwhile, the army of American workers which seeks to elevate labor through the Republican policy is stronger than it was two years ago. Then President Cleveland had 219 electoral votes, and Mr. Blaine 192 ; this fall, States having 211 electoral votes have sustained the Republican party in the election of Congressmen, and States having only 190 have sustained the Democratic party.

The labor movement in New York prepares the way for a larger acceptance of Republican principles by the workingmen of this city and the nation. It is a breaking up of the old sod, and something well worth harvesting will grow in due season.

A REPUBLICAN.

II.

THE LABOR PARTY VIEW.

THE late contest for the chief municipal office of New York marks an historical epoch. The movement to elect Henry George to that office has been something exceptional, in fact, unique, in its inception, in its growth, and in its results, in the character of its originators, in the sympathies it won, and in the opposition it evoked. It has had an unprecedented effect in confusing and disabling political plans and factions ; and it has rendered inevitable, has, in fact, already begun, the disintegration and reconstruction of political parties. It is the beginning of a pacific revolution which is destined to have upon the whole world a more beneficent effect than our first Revolution and the great Declaration which gave it its justification and battle-cry.

All this was substantially said by me at the meeting in Chickering Hall a month before the election, and was then no doubt regarded by not a few as but a campaign extravagance—a mere rhapsody inspired by foolish hopefulness of the perfectibility of human society, and by a simple but absurdly enthusiastic hero-worship. Events, however, have largely justified the declaration made at that meeting.

After our mighty civil struggle had ended, with a Union restored and a race emancipated ; after the question of reconstruction had been settled, and a large part of the burdens of the war discharged ; after its deepest wounds had been healed, and even their scars obliterated, everything might have seemed to promise

a long period of unexampled national prosperity and contentment. Instead of this, a new sense of disappointment and discontent began to steal over the workers of the country. With increasing wealth, they felt the pressure of increasing want. Labor in mill and mine, on railroad and farm, became more and more conscious of a wrong, in the want of opportunity to employ itself, and in the inadequate share of the product of his toil which came back to the toiler. Maddened and blinded, the giant Labor too often struck out wildly to his own hurt, and eagerly snatched at such panaceas as "protection," urged on him by the quacks, who found profit in his ignorance. Strikes, wasteful and sometimes violent; lock-outs, long and heartless, increased and multiplied. Waves of industrial depression followed each other with a regular periodicity which suggested a law of nature. The cry was heard everywhere, "the rich were becoming richer and the poor poorer." "Hail, Columbia, happy land!" was no longer sung with the same heartiness as in the childhood of the nation, and even the Fourth of July seemed to have lost the freshness of its charm. In the reading of the magnificent assertion of the natural equality of man, and his inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, there seemed to many an undertone of mockery. But deeply as the growing wrong was felt, there was a failure to clearly see its cause. Voices many were raised in complaint, but they were now the roar of a strong lion helpless in the toils, and now the wail of a child crying in the night. There was lacking the clear articulate speech of a man who, seeing a great truth, sounds a trumpet-call to all who would taste the fierce delight of battle against wrong.

But the hour came at last, and with it the man. The Duke of Argyll spoke better than he knew, when he sneeringly called Henry George the "Prophet of San Francisco." No heart has sympathized more keenly with the sufferings of the toiler, no other pen has defined the wrong so clearly, and portrayed with such force and pathos the poverty that haunts progress like a spectre. No other voice has rung so loud and clear in calling men to take up the cross of a new crusade for justice, to proclaim the glad tidings of a new evangel to the poor, that shall relieve them from the degradation of want, and the deeper degradation of the fear of want. His cry rang forth, calling on the conscience of men to restore to the disinherited their equal share in the bounties of nature, and

thus to fit their hearts and minds the better to receive and act out the old evangel of Him, who taught the universal Fatherhood of God and the equal Brotherhood of men. The common people of old heard the Christ gladly as He preached to them the blessedness of those that hunger and thirst after justice; and in the common people of to-day the same sure instinct responds to the call for social right-doing.

What gives to the late election its deep importance is that it marks the coming of a great principle into our politics; that it is a flashing into action of sentiments that have spread and are yet spreading wide and deep throughout the land and over the world. Henry George's nomination was no accident. The working-people of New York, like their fellows throughout the country, have been reading and talking over his books, and are better acquainted with them, and have a keener appreciation of them, than most men of leisure and culture. They have learned from Henry George's teachings an effectual and peaceful method of righting their wrongs, by the reformation of law on the lines of justice. They have got from him a new hope and courage; they have learned that the remedy must be political, since the wrong is political, proceeding from enactments that give to a few that which belongs to all. Henry George has taught them that it is not desirable nor possible to divide land equally; that the right of the individual is not to an equal division, but to an equal benefit from a common ownership. Henry George has shown that the beautiful economic law of rent suggests a simple and peaceful means of giving to every human being just what belongs to him of the common estate. He shows that rent is a good, not a bad, thing; that it is a gauge of the degree of progress from semi-barbaric, nomadic conditions up to conditions of the highest civilization. He shows that economic rent—that "unearned increment" which attaches to land by reason of the growth of population and the progress of civilization—is a value produced by the social aggregate, as distinguished from the value produced by the individual, and that thus is provided, by natural law, a common fund which may be drawn on for common needs without hampering capital or oppressing labor by taxes which check production and raise prices. He shows that it is just that he who is permitted to enjoy the advantage or privilege of occupying a larger or choicer portion of the common estate than is open to another, should pay

the highest market price for this advantage: that is rent. The wrong is not in the payment of rent, but in its diversion from a common treasury into private pockets, and in the locking up of natural opportunities by the speculation which the possibility of appropriating this public revenue provokes. Henry George has taught that in this appropriation of rent by private persons, and in the forestalling which it engenders, is to be found the cause of that increasing poverty which is the dark side of progressing civilization, the true cause of the industrial depressions in which productive power is so enormously wasted, and in which willing hands cannot clothe the naked back, or feed the hungry stomach, because labor is shut out from natural opportunities for its employment by the speculation that holds land idle until it can get a blackmail price.

How this speculation in land grinds down the wages of labor, cuts down the profits of capital, and brings about these periodical industrial depressions, "Progress and Poverty" and "Social Problems" have taught the thousands on thousands who have read them. They have shown how the simple remedy of the appropriation of economic rent to its proper purpose, the public use, would destroy speculation in the elements of nature, and thus open to labor the natural opportunities which are required for the production of wealth; how in reality there is no conflict between labor and capital, but that the real conflict is between labor and monopoly. Workingmen have learned from Henry George that the simple reform which would thus give them the highest possible wages would make the cost of living much lower, since the enormous taxes which now fall with oppressive weight on the poor, and are a fruitful source of political corruption, could be entirely remitted, as no longer necessary. All the public needs that are now supplied by taxation, and many public conveniences and advantages which we have not yet become civilized enough to supply at public cost, could be provided for out of the common fund—the rent which individuals would pay to a community that included themselves.

When, therefore, organized labor, as represented in the Central Labor Union of New York City, determined to take political action, it was necessary and fitting that the doctrine of "the land for the people"—the doctrine that all are entitled to share in the benefits provided by their Creator, and the advantages which come

with social growth and improvement—should be made, as it was, the chief principle of their platform,—a platform which, in its bold simplicity, is in inspiring contrast to the straddling duplicities of the old party declarations.. And it was equally fitting that they should call on Henry George to become their spokesman and standard-bearer. No other man could so well fit the platform.

When, some three or four months ago, members of the Central Labor Union began to talk among themselves of the propriety of political action, the most sanguine among them had little hope of doing more than making a small beginning. Mr. George from the first was spoken of as the candidate who could command the strongest following ; yet the best they hoped for was that an independent Labor candidate might get some 15,000 votes. For they sadly remember how, a few years ago, a Labor candidate for Mayor polled only 87 votes. They knew by experience how strong were the political organizations of New York, how potent the “influences” on which these relied, and how general was the indisposition of men to “throw their votes away” on a candidate who had not a “regular” nomination. Mr. George’s own friends felt that his world-wide reputation, and the cause with which he, more than any other man, is identified, should not be subjected to the risk of being made ridiculous by a hopeless canvass. But pressed to accept the nomination, and anxious to maintain the dignity of his cause, and to inspire those disposed to vote for him with confidence in themselves, Mr. George conditioned his acceptance on a pledge from 30,000 voters, explaining the significance of the movement and of his candidacy in his now famous letter to the Secretary of the Labor Union Conference. That letter began the campaign. It infused into the movement a peculiar dignity and enthusiasm. Clergymen, lawyers, teachers, authors, business men of all kinds, joined the Labor men in requesting Mr. George to be a candidate, and crowded the meetings held to ratify his nomination.

The campaign is so recent that it would be useless to recount it here. Great as must have been the growth in economic and political education, in self-respect and self-restraint, in the ranks of organized labor to produce the astonishing result, yet it must be conceded that no other platform and no other candidate could have secured such a tremendous moral victory. It is the reputation of the candidate, his high genius and exalted character, his

practical wisdom and masterly leadership, his tireless energy, the strange fascination his personality exerts, and the almost religious enthusiasm which he has been able to inspire by his presentation of the cause, that have given to the 68,000 men, who, in spite of all difficulties, voted for him, and to the thousands more in New York who are now prepared to join them, the consciousness of power, the conviction of duty, and the confidence of ultimate success. Thus has come to the front a new Land and Labor party, from henceforth utterly distinct from all other parties, prepared to go forth conquering and to conquer; and on the same platform and under the same leader to repeat, at the earliest possible moment, in the State and in the nation, this magnificent canvass, and to more than repeat the moral victory of the late municipal election in New York.

EDWARD MCGLYNN.

III.

THE DEMOCRATIC VIEW.

OUR party names are often misleading. This is especially so to strangers. Often while abroad, I have been asked to explain the differences in the tenets and aims of our political parties. When I have said that the Democratic was the Conservative and the Republican the Radical party, strangers to our politics became confused. When I have undertaken to define the distinguishing features of these parties, no better definition occurred than that which our much-abused platforms give.

The Democratic platform is positive; the Republican platform negative. The salient creed of the former is found in its exposition of the Federal system with its declaration of limited powers, State rights, and anti-consolidation. Jefferson was its political Copernicus. The civil war interrupted but did not destroy this exposition. The Federal Supreme Bench and all other Courts expound it. Governor Gordon, of Georgia, loyally pronounced it in his recent Inaugural.

The excesses which arose from its extreme interpretation swung the pendulum to one extreme; and then the excesses of reconstruction swung it to the other. Republican war-powers and extra-constitutional policies illustrate its last phase. Now, under Democratic ascendancy, it is reaching its just poise. It is Jefferson, and not Hamilton, whose political philosophy is dominant.

This is the Ithuriel spear, with its celestial temper, which is the test of false social and political doctrines. From its lightest touch, up starts the perilous fiend of our politics—Centralization.

Amid the multifarious platforms which our politics beget, next to the equality of the States and inclusive of it, is the system of local government for local purposes and the general government for general purposes only. The corollaries of these propositions are in the Tenth Amendment, if indeed, it is not the fountain of them.

The party, new or old, which forgets this exposition has already forged the keys to the vaults of the Treasury and the “enchanted chambers of power.”

The Republican party, if not by its origin, by its practice, is the natural ally of corruption; not because its members are dishonest, but because its tenets antagonize the rules of right and the codes of interpretation preservative of honest administration.

The Tenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution was made to nullify the “general welfare” clause. The Democratic faith is founded on this Tenth Amendment. That Amendment is Democratic in its quality and moral in its practical application. Many of the evils, social and otherwise, which threaten our peace, stability, and perpetuity, are found among those who would centralize political power at the Federal centre, and moneyed and landed power in favored classes. Those who would overstep the fixed limits of Federal or State political authority, do not know the meaning of the maxim: that “the world is governed too much,” or the safeguard to property, person, and liberty, by limiting government to its written restrictions and granted powers. Whether in land-tenure or taxation, lax interpretation is the mother of injustice and rapine.

The late elections show that party lines are yet held tenaciously, notwithstanding much independent voting. Although the Republican candidate for Mayor in New York City ran 15,071 behind Davenport’s vote for Governor last year, still the former vote shows, along with the State vote for Judge Daniels, a permanent element. Besides, the elections reveal a half-dozen close States, as to whose future no *à priori* reasoning is valuable.

What, then, do the elections teach? In so far as they insure

Democratic triumph, they conserve strict construction, local rule, and honest administration. This is the nature of this triumph. A few facts will serve to display its extent. Generally midway in an administration, the dominant party suffers. It is then the target. Then, generally, the Congress-elect is hostile to the Administration. That the Democracy still retains its ascendancy—State, National, and municipal—is a sign of success under adverse conditions. It still has the Chief Magistrate of the United States and of the State of New York. It has added to the gubernatorial list the States of Colorado and California. It has preserved its dominance in the Lower House of Congress, though by a less majority,—a result by no means regrettable, when solid work is to be done. Its majority may reach a score. Although it may have lost in Southern States—notably in Virginia, it has on advanced lines of political and economic thought made inroads upon the Western and New England States. Massachusetts and Minnesota, as well as Nebraska and New Hampshire, give sign of intelligent movement. The Legislatures of New Jersey, Indiana, and California are Democratic. There is a gain of three in the Federal Senate. This leaves a doubtful Republican majority of two in that body ; the two Senators on most of the issues which divide the two great parties, inclining to the Democratic side.

What, then, is there to discourage the Democracy, either in the present or for 1888 ? It is not to be found in the Electoral vote as now indicated ; for the Democracy are reasonably sure of over 201 votes. In this estimate, neither Virginia nor any other Southern State is counted adversely ; nor is it necessary to count Colorado, California, or Massachusetts Democratic. New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey are Democratic, and likely to remain so. In the composition of the Lower House, as yet incomplete, the Democrats probably, in case of failure to elect by the Electoral College, have the advantage. Is it, then, too optimistic, in view of the facts, to consider the Electoral College as Democratic ?

I asked a leading New York journalist : “ What is the key to this election ? ” He said : “ New York.” True, without New York, the Democracy cannot win. The Republicans with it can win in 1888. New York is the battle-ground. The recent election shows it to be Democratic, on the popular vote for Judge Peckham. Its close vote may have been determined in favor of President Cleveland and Governor Hill by the Prohibitionists.

Give that vote its natural drift, and the Republicans can carry New York, not to speak of New Jersey. The Prohibition vote is thought to be transient and declining. This is not a fair inference from the facts. Its gain from 1884 to 1886 is 97,730. In New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania the gain is 36,980. It is growing in New York, as its vote over that of 1885 shows. Its natural drift would be Republican, just as the Labor vote should be Democratic. If the Labor vote remain compact, it bids fair to favor its enemy, rather than its friend. This is one of the whimsies of politics.

As to the question concerning the currency, there was no special verdict. It seems to have had little effect, and little interest was displayed on that topic. As to the tariff: Is the deplorable defeat of Colonel Morrison and others, who propose its reform, or the narrow escape of Mr. Speaker Carlisle, suggestive of its waning? Admitting the force of these blows at our leaders, the cause survives. Nobody of consequence proposes to abolish the tariff. On articles made abroad which compete with those made here, there will be tariffs, with such discrimination as selfish, local, and industrial interests demand. The Republicans, reckless of revenue, want protection to pet industries; not for revenue only, but that the mass who are consumers shall pay tribute to the few. We are apt to forget that the great interests of this country are not so much from the hand of man, as from Nature. You may protect wool and cotton, and their fabrics, coal, metals, etc. Our land has a larger factory than that which fabricates these articles. It is an enduring factory, in which sun, rain, and soil, and the ceaseless round of seasons, under human industry, ply their shuttles. How insignificant are the products of other factories, run by water or its vapor, compared with the immense laboratory in which our cattle, corn, cotton, cheese, and what not, are produced! It is these products, beyond our home needs, that require not legislation, but repeal. For these, foreign markets are demanded. If they have not an outlet, they will fall in price, and the land with them. To keep that outlet, in years of good harvests, we must barter abroad. We cannot sell unless we buy. Bankruptcy intervenes to stop unmutual trade. The gold and imports which have come to us in the last ten years are not the result of our manufactures, but of our farms. God and man, the elements and not the parties, gave us that prosperity which lifted

us out of troubles, debts, and panics into well-being. In spite of Republican policies, and because of good harvests here and bad ones abroad, resumption was possible.

Good times move *pari passu* with President Cleveland's administration. Paralysis has not stricken our giant limbs; the strong man arose in his might, like Antæus from the earth. In the face of cruel and selfish policies, our crops changed the balance of trade, and made us the provider of the Old World. But shall we therefore forget that there are other fields than our own, where grain-stuffs are harvested? Do we remember that India, even more than Russia, is increasing her facilities of transportation? When her soil-values become competitive with our own, tariff reform will come like a flood.

It is too bad that nature has not rebelled against a Democratic Administration so as to gratify pious statesmen and affect our elections. But our industries refuse to be paralyzed. Business refuses to abandon its marts. Of course, Republicans, and they only, planted the seed, grafted the twigs, and gave to the sweet air the blossom and the fragrance; they culled the fruitage of our Hesperides, and sent it abroad. It was all their work. Bring forth the royal diadem, and crown them Lords of all. Of course, they fought the war, abolished slavery, and paid all the taxes. They did more. They picked the cotton-pod and baled the cotton. They sowed the wheat and planted the corn. They ground the corn into gold and the wheat into silver. Do they believe all the marvels of which they boast? Does the astute statesman of Maine want to build up industries by the same methods which has kept Maine and her ship-building laggard, when every other State under better policies and with providential help is bounding to the front? Would he keep the country in discord for his party's success, or depress, hinder, and anathematize the South, to the general discouragement of business and the embroiling again of the sections? What if the South refuses to be discordant, and the country declines to be in a perpetual panic? What if the Federal representation under the constitution continues to be based on population, and not on votes? The elections indicate a desire for peaceful methods on constitutional bases. If in the Fiftieth Congress an adverse Senate refuses even to consider economic reforms, or second a Democratic House in pursuing both the Republican and Democratic platforms—as well as the doctrines of

the Labor apostle, Mr. George—there is not much lost, in comparison with the action of the Forty-ninth Congress. The gain in the obstructive Senate is on the side of the liberalities of trade and the reduction of taxes.

Is it asked : “How does the election affect the standing of President Cleveland and his administration?” It may be answered that nothing on these points seems absolutely decided. The effect of patronage, civil service, offensive partisanship, non-removal of Republicans, and other features of the Administration, including its foreign policy, is not apparent in the general verdict. In some States, one result is alleged with plausibility ; and in another, another result. The truth is, that as there was no uniformity in the cause, or policy, so there is both gain and loss to the Democracy in different States, as a consequence. New England may have one voice, Virginia probably another. The fact remains, that from one cause or another, the Democracy maintain control.

Ah ! but there is a lion in the path—a hideous *bête noir*. It is Henry George and the Labor vote. It is not to be disguised that this vote is surprising. In the total of 219,992 in New York city, he polled 68,110. This is the voice of Discontent, peacefully expressed. It is a vehement protest against Plutocracy. But let it be remembered, that in the leading or economic issue for 1888, as Mr. Blaine forces it, Mr. George is along with, if not ahead of, the Democracy. As the Labor element is protective, herein is the seed of its disintegration ; for if Mr. George be the persistent advocate, which he is represented to be, he must vindicate his economic thought. If he be not such a champion, he will be unable to weld a permanent party of “Progressive Democracy.”

Another element of disintegration of the Labor party may appear if it fail to act in harmony with the Democratic party. Unless thus harmonized, how can it march successfully against unjust inequalities of fortune and monsters of monopoly ? Democratic platforms have favored the incorporation of labor organizations and the repeal of all laws restricting the free action of Labor. Not to speak of the numerous laws upon this head which have passed Democratic State Legislatures, nine bills passed the present Democratic Federal branch. Only two of these have passed the Republican Senate. The pledge of the Democratic National

platform of 1880 was "to protect the laboring man alike against the Cormorant and the Commune." Thus it is in accord with the National-Greenback-Labor sentiment, which, when in full tide, denounced the red flag of Communism imported from Europe, which asked for an equal division of property; and equally denounced the corporate Communism which has accomplished by corrupt influences the unequal divisions of property.

Monopolistic schemes, whether by land-grants and tariff, or by judicial decision and legislative enactment, destroy the rewards of toil and the incentives to industry. The Democracy has been and will be, from its constituent elements, the only potential ally of Labor in the coming contests against these chartered irregularities. Some of these wrongs are remediless by statute. The remedy for others is to be found in adherence to the Democratic creed of limited powers. Forfeitures of public lands for misuse or non-use of charters, the regulation of inter-State transportation, questions of taxation, Federal and local, direct and indirect, on personal and real estate, and on inheritances, the mitigation of the legal severities and disabilities of Labor and the elevation of the toiler,—these will find their best association with the Democratic party. If not found there, where will it be found? These questions are of more moment than those of civil-service reform and silver coinage, for they are fundamental. They go to the very existence of society and order.

If it be urged that the vote for Mr. George, the formulation of his ideas and the formation of his party, detract from the Democracy, it may be answered, that there is only one impregnable barrier against excesses. As the function of government, whether Federal, State, or municipal, is limited to the prescript, the conservatism of the country will rally upon the frontier of written and granted powers. There is only one pass over and beyond this boundary. It leads into the wide domain of elementary discussion, where sits the Witenagemote of an omnipotent sovereignty. New York has said that her present constitution requires revision. Her people have accomplished what Gambetta called the peaceful revolution of the horologue. The wisdom of the present has concluded to scrutinize the unwisdom of a half-century ago. New factors of civilization have led to vast advancements in our State, counties and cities. A new political establishment is invoked. As no law is irrevocable, and as the organic law itself is amenable to

change, the labor reformers have here, providentially or accidentally almost, an arena prepared for them. Here is a safe and valid vent for their cherished ideologies. Here they may burn their explosives on the surface harmlessly, subject to "bucolic" ratification. If the prescribed mode be pursued, there is no limitation on the popular power of this State, in establishing its fundamental law, except one—the Federal constitution. The convention crowns popular sovereignty! Therein the wildest vagaries may have acceptance or confutation. Does the Labor advocate desire new laws to effectuate his system of taxing the naked land and exempting its improvements? Here is his field! No charges of anarchy, or communism, are here logical. No judicial decision may appall. As the writer said, when in Congress, on the 10th of January, 1865, in favoring the right to amend the Federal constitution, abolishing slavery:

"This power of unlimited amendment is an element of Democracy. Our ancestry, however prudent and wise, did not tie the hands of the children nor shackle their liberties by laws so irrevocable that no mode of change was allowed. In our State constitutions, this power of amendment has been and is being exercised almost every decade. Why? On the principle of Jeremy Bentham (*Benthamiana*, p. 220), that at each point of time the sovereign for the time possesses such means as the nature of the case affords, for making himself acquainted with the exigencies of his own time. With reference to the future, he has no such means." Bentham thus argues against the transfer of the government from those who possess the best means to those who possess the least means of information. Shall the past century rule the present? No, not unless they are better informed, or feel more interest in the future generation than their own. Why should we of the nineteenth century tie up the hands of the twentieth? Why should the dead forever rule the living? Is a tyranny inexorable because it is established in the past? Is a law immutable because made by the fathers? If the law be despotic, who then shall reverse it? Mr. Bentham says: "Suppose a law a good one, it will be supported not by absurdity and deception, but from its own excellency. A declaration that this or that law is immutable, so far from being a proper argument to enforce its permanency, is rather a presumption that such a law has some mischievous tendency."

Here, then, is the forum for the practical or visionary reformer. Here is the ordeal of "Progressive Democracy." If it have vitality enough to survive this ordeal, it will be armed for 1888. Its Knights of Labor will be thrice armed. If it be right, that the realty alone should be taxed; that no one should hold the land, with its minerals, its crops, or its structures; and that the land, and its increment should go to the State, for the common benefit, then let it be shown. The burden rests on all innovators. The Convention will be open. Let the new theses as to railroad and telegraph ownership by the State; the abolition of taxation upon buildings, improvements, and all other things of human production, and taxation on the value of land alone to provide for purposes of common necessity and benefit, be nailed upon the very door-posts of the Convention!

The success of Mr. Hewitt in challenging these and other propositions has radical significance. It is more extensive than the interests of New York City and State. In making the contest, aloof from the mire of city and State politics; in raising the issue of law with liberty, or liberty without law, above class and party prejudices and the sordid allurements of equalizing possessions, into the purer atmosphere of social and ethical discussion, Mr. Hewitt elevated our municipal conflict. It is now a contest—State, national, and international.

For this, he deserves the meed of praise from every patriot and student of social science. The issue he makes is so relevant to the prevailing discontent, and so clear to the mind of the people, that the strength and weakness of the contending theories, and the consequences of their adoption or rejection, are apparent. We are now enabled to make upon the quivering body politic a vivisection of its vital elements for the instruction of the thoughtful suffragan. Herein lies the most pregnant lesson of the late election; and New York City and State were happily chosen as the theatre for the demonstration.

S. S. Cox.